

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

Marquis Aurbach Coffing

Craig R. Anderson, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 6882

Brian R. Hardy, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 10068

10001 Park Run Drive

Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

Telephone: (702) 382-0711

Facsimile: (702) 382-5816

canderson@maclaw.com

bhardy@maclaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Frank Hunewill

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CALVARY CHAPEL DAYTON VALLEY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STEVE SISOLAK, in his official capacity as
Governor of Nevada; AARON FORD, in his
official capacity as Attorney General of
Nevada; FRANK HUNEWILL, in his official
capacity as Sheriff of Lyon County,

Defendant.

Case Number:

3:20-cv-00303-LRH-CLB

DEFENDANT FRANK HUNEWILL'S
LIMITED OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE MOTION
AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
FOR AN INJUNCTION PENDING
APPEAL

Defendant, Frank Hunewill, in his official capacity as Sheriff of Lyon County, (the "Sherriff"), by and through his attorneys of record, the law firm of Marquis Aurbach Coffing, hereby files his Limited Opposition to Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion and Memorandum in Support for an Injunction Pending Appeal [ECF No. 47] filed in the above referenced matter. This Opposition is made and based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, all pleadings and papers on file herein, and any oral argument allowed at the time of the hearing.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

On June 9, 2020, this Court conducted a hearing on Plaintiff's motions for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction filed on May 28 and May 29, 2020. *See* ECF Nos. 9, 19. After considering all pleadings, papers and evidence on file and the arguments of the parties, the Court issued its Order denying both motions. *See* ECF No. 43. Plaintiff's acknowledge the same standard applies to an injunction pending appeal as applied to is prior motion and proffer no new evidence or arguments in favor of its position. *See* ECF No. 47 at 2:5-8. Rather, Plaintiff acknowledges that its pending motion is nothing more than the exhaustion of procedural hurdle on its way to the Ninth Circuit. *Id.* at 3:3-10. Given the foregoing, there is nothing new or novel that can or should change this Court's Order.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

In evaluating a motion for an injunction pending appeal, the court considers whether the moving party has demonstrated that (1) they are likely to succeed on the merits, (2) they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, (3) the balance of equities tips in their favor, and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); *see also Feldman v. Ariz. Sec'y of State's Office*, 843 F.3d 366, 367 (9th Cir. 2016) ("The standard for evaluating an injunction pending appeal is similar to that employed by district courts in deciding whether to grant a preliminary injunction.").

Given this Court denied Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction, it must first pursue an injunction pending appeal here before it may request one on an emergency basis from the Ninth Circuit. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 8(a)(1)(C); Ninth Circuit Rule 27-3(c)(v). As such, the Sherriff incorporates his legal arguments from his prior submission in opposition to Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction. *See* ECF No. 32. In sum, and without waiving any specific arguments made therein or at the hearing in this matter, the Sherriff

1 acknowledges that the United States Supreme Court recently issued a determination denying
 2 similarly sought injunctive relief for a church challenging California's temporary restrictions
 3 on public gatherings in light of COVID-19 wherein it stated:

4 The precise question of when restrictions on particular social activities should
 5 be lifted during the pandemic is a dynamic and fact-intensive matter subject
 6 to reasonable disagreement. Our Constitution principally entrusts "[t]he
 7 safety and the health of the people" to the politically accountable officials of
 8 the States "to guard and protect." *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11, 38
 9 (1905). When those officials "undertake[] to act in areas fraught with
 10 medical and scientific uncertainties," their latitude "must be especially
 broad." *Marshall v. United States*, 414 U. S. 417, 427 (1974). Where those
 broad limits are not exceeded, they should not be subject to second-guessing
 by an "unelected federal judiciary," which lacks the background,
 competence, and expertise to assess public health and is not accountable to
 the people. *See Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*, 469 U.
 S. 528, 545 (1985).

11 *See South Bay United Pentecostal Church, et al. v. Newsom, et al.* Case No. 19A1044, 2020
 12 WL 2813056 at *2 (May 29, 2020). Further, the Sheriff affirms that the "question of when
 13 restrictions on particular social activities should be lifted during the pandemic *is a dynamic*
 14 *and fact-intensive matter subject to reasonable disagreement.*" *Id.* (emphasis added). Such
 15 questions of fact may not be best accomplished through general directives. Rather, it is
 16 important for the officials entrusted to "to guard and protect" the "safety and health of the
 17 people" to act in such areas. *Id.* (citing *Jacobson*, 197 U.S. at 38).

18 Here, each county and their elected officials should be afforded discretion and
 19 latitude with respect to the enforcement of all such restrictions. Here, the Sheriff has not and
 20 will not be using his limited law enforcement resources to monitor church attendance and/or
 21 parishioners' adherence to social distancing recommendations. Rather, the Sherriff is
 22 optimistic that his fellow Lyon County residents will reasonably adhere to all CDC
 23 guidelines and he encourages Lyon County residents to act appropriately to assure they and
 24 their neighbors remain safe and healthy. Nevertheless, if there is a call, complaint or issue
 25 reported, then such will be investigated and afforded the appropriate response necessary
 26 under the circumstances.

1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 Given the lack of any new arguments, evidence or changes in the state of the law,
3 this Court should deny Plaintiff's Motion so that it can exhaust this procedural hurdle on its
4 way to the Ninth Circuit.

5 Dated this 17th day of June, 2020.

6 MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING
7

8
9 By /s/ Brian R. Hardy, Esq.
10 Craig R. Anderson, Esq.
11 Nevada Bar No. 6882
12 Brian R. Hardy, Esq.
13 Nevada Bar No. 10068
14 10001 Park Run Drive
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
16 Attorney(s) for Defendant Frank Hunewill
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING

10001 Park Run Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
(702) 382-0711 FAX: (702) 382-5816

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing **DEFENDANT FRANK HUNEWILL'S LIMITED OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE MOTION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR AN INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL** with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court by using the court's CM/ECF system on the 17th day of June, 2020.

☒ I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

☐ I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing document by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Jason D. Guinasso
500 Damonte Ranch Pkwy, Ste 980
Reno, NV 89521
jguinasso@hutchlegal.com

Craig A. Newby
Office of the Attorney General
100 N. Carson St.
Carson City, NV 89701
Attorney for Defendant Steve Sisolak and Aaron Ford

Kristen K. Waggoner
Ryan J. Tucker
Jeremiah Galus
ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM
15100 N. 90th St.
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
kwaggoner@adflegal.org
rtucker@adflegal.org
jgalus@adflegal.org

David A. Cortman
ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM
1000 Hurricane Shoals Rd. NE Ste. D-1100
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
dcortman@ADFlegal.org
pro hac vice fapplication forthcoming
Attorneys for Plaintiff Calvary Chapel
Dayton Valley

/s/ Michelle Monkarsh
an employee of Marquis Aurbach Coffing